

the question of gun regulation and gun safety?" Mr. Speaker, it is time now to ask the question of an extended waiting period so that someone would not amass 14, 15, 30 guns, more than the United States military, and a serious background check dealing with any issues that would impact a person's stability in having guns.

Yes, people do kill, not guns, but they use guns to kill. I have been through too many of these, Mr. Speaker, from Columbine to this incident. Every single one I have been through since being in the United States Congress. It is time for the Congress to act.

IMPORTANT ISSUES THAT AFFECT AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House is drawn to many, many issues this week. Certainly, the tragedy in Oregon draws all of our attention, our sympathy, but unfortunately not our vote. We have never really had a vote here on the floor of the House to deal with this issue of gun safety; although, legislation has been passed around many, many times.

Even the most conservative columnists are now saying that we must take action, and we really should. So I will just start by saying to all of our colleagues: Let's vote, vote up or down on the various proposals that have been made.

Certainly the attention of this body is turned to who is going to be the next Speaker. It seems to occupy most of the discussion and most of the articles in the newspapers around this town. It is important, but there are many, many other issues that come before the House. Some of them are really going to affect America.

I want to talk about one of them today, and it is in the context of something we have been discussing here for the last 4 or 5 years. We call it Make It In America. It is about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. It is about rebuilding the American middle class. It is about creating jobs in America by doing what we once did so very, very well, which is manufacturing. Make things: big things, little things, all kinds of things. We call it our Make It In America agenda.

I am going to go through it very quickly here and then focus on one piece of this agenda. Here it is: trade policies. This is going to take a lot of time to discuss this. We are not going to go into it today, but the President announced just in the last couple days that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is done.

Now, we don't know what is in it. We have—at least I have—great concerns

about this and that it will be one more step in hollowing out the American manufacturing sector, but it is all secret. We don't know yet. We will find out soon enough, and we will undoubtedly come back and talk about trade.

Taxes and tax policies, I will hit on this in a few moments.

Labor issues, well, that ties back to the trade issue and whether we are going to send more of our jobs overseas.

Education, research, infrastructure, today I really want to focus on this energy and infrastructure. If you bear with me a few moments, I want to go into this in some detail.

For many, many years, we have tried to make America energy independent, and in the last 5 years, 6 years now, we have seen an enormous increase in the production of energy in the United States.

Now, a lot of that energy has come from green technologies—solar, wind, and biofuels—and many other ways of producing renewable energy called green energy. That is good because all of that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and we need to do more of it.

Frankly, we need tax policy.

Maybe I will put this back up again so I can point out the way in which the Make It In America agenda fits all of this.

Tax policy has a great deal to do with green energy. There are tax breaks for solar installation on your home, solar installation for businesses, the production tax credit for wind and solar. All of these things make it really possible to advance the green energy agenda.

Tax policy also has a great deal to do with the other part of our energy independence—we are not quite there, but we are making great advances on it—and that has to do with petroleum products: natural gas and crude oil.

There has been much talk about the Bakken revolution in Wyoming and North Dakota producing a lot of energy. We are talking about different techniques to extract oil, enhanced oil production, otherwise known as fracking. All of these things have led to an explosion—well, literally, in the case of the Bakken fuel because it is highly volatile, and it does explode when trains tip over.

But what we are talking about here is an explosion in the volume of oil and natural gas produced in America. We have literally doubled the production of natural gas and oil over the last 5 to 6 years, bringing down the cost of fuel. Also, around the world, the slowdown of the Chinese economy and Europe have reduced the demand for oil, and we are seeing a reduced price of oil on the world market, even at a time when we are seeing more and more production of crude oil and natural gas here in the United States.

What does all this mean to the oil industry, to the petroleum industry? It means they have got a lot of oil, and the United States is not consuming all

of it or as much as they would like to keep the prices up. So guess what they want to do. They want to export oil. Isn't that something?

□ 1945

How do we become energy-independent if we are exporting oil? Well, we have got a lot of interesting economic arguments about how that could be done. I am saying I don't think so.

I don't think it is in the interest of the United States to take a strategic national asset—natural gas, crude oil—and export it to China. It may be good for China. It certainly would be good for the energy industry, the petroleum industry. Wow, they have got a new market.

You see, right now there is a Federal ban on the export of crude oil to other countries, with the exception of Mexico and Canada. We swap crude oil back and forth. A little bit of crude oil is also shipped out of the United States from the North Slope of Alaska.

A very interesting law was established back in the seventies, when there was this energy crisis and there were long lines at the gasoline pumps. That law said: No. You cannot export crude oil.

And then later, in the 1990s, there was a little opening provided for Mexico and Canada and for Alaska North Slope oil. It could be shipped to other countries—exported—with this caveat: You cannot increase domestic oil prices.

I don't know that that was ever enforced. We certainly saw the gasoline prices zip to the top last year. Now it is coming back down, and that is good. It is bad that it went up, good that it is coming down.

But I don't think the Department of Energy or the Department of Commerce really enforced what was in the law about the export of crude oil from Alaska.

So we have got this strategic asset—natural gas and crude oil—that has allowed us to have a resurgence of American manufacturing. They are coming home. American manufacturers are coming home to make it in America.

Dow, a big chemical operation, is coming back to America because natural gas prices are low. Other companies are doing the same thing. Because the United States has a strategic advantage as a result of strategic assets: oil and natural gas, together with green energy.

So what does the petroleum industry want to do? They want to ruin all of that. They want to take the strategic assets and ship them overseas.

This week the House of Representatives is going to take up a piece of legislation that opens the spigot for the export of crude oil. There is already an open spigot for the export of natural gas. I will come to that in a few moments.

So is this in the interest of the United States? Well, if you are in the oil patch—North Dakota, Texas, maybe

even California—maybe it is good. Maybe you will be able to make a little more money.

But at the expense of who? America, American consumers at the pump, truckers, trains. All of those use diesel produced here in the United States from our refineries.

So good for the petroleum industry, but bad for America. We ought not do that. And if you would consider for a few moments that, should we ever allow the export of crude oil, we ought to put some serious caveats on that piece of legislation.

But just today the Rules Committee of this House decided no, no, no caveats. Just a bare bill. Open the spigot. Send the crude oil overseas. Don't worry about the price of fuel. Don't worry about the price of energy in the United States. Worry about the bottom line of the petroleum industry.

I say time out. Wait a minute. This is America. This is about the American economy. This is about men and women that go to the gas pump and buy gasoline, farmers out there having to buy diesel in order to plow their fields and harvest their crops, trains moving goods and services back across the United States, the airline industry.

This is not just about the petroleum industry. This is a big deal for America. If we take a strategic national asset and just allow it to go anywhere in the world so that it is to the benefit of a small, but important, slice of the American economy, we are making a big mistake.

So let me just put some caveats on this piece of legislation. Harken back to the Alaska situation back in 1995 where they opened the spigot. They put in a caveat that said: No. You can't do it if it results in an adverse effect on the price of transportation fuels and home heating fuels in the United States.

Does the legislation we have this week have any caveats on it? No. It doesn't have that one.

Let me give you another caveat. If we are going to ship a strategic national asset overseas, why don't we look at other strategic assets in the United States, shipbuilding?

The entire United States Navy is dependent on American shipyards for all of their ships. Those shipyards no longer produce large, ocean-going commercial vessels. All of that has been off to China, off to Korea and Japan. All of those countries subsidize those shipyards. We don't do it in the United States.

But we can put caveats on the export of this crude oil and simply say, if we are going to export crude oil, caveat one, not at the expense of American consumers; two, not at the expense of American refiners and other strategic asset—the refinery of these petroleum products; and, three, ship it on American-built ships with American mariners.

Right now there are over 400,000 men and women working in the shipyards

producing smaller ships for trade within the coastal zone of the United States and for the barges up and down the rivers and canals of the United States, but not building ocean-going tankers. What does it mean? Well, let me just give you an example.

It has been estimated that the maximum amount of oil that could be shipped is somewhere about 3.6 million barrels a day. That is at the top level. Hopefully, they will never get close to that because that is almost certain to raise prices. But let's say that they do.

For the largest tanker currently on the ocean today—these are the maximum tankers, too large to even go through the new Panama Canal and larger than the Panamax ships—it would take 180 ships to handle 3.6 million barrels of oil a day.

What if those ships were American-built ships? This isn't Saudi Arabian oil. This isn't Iraqi oil, Venezuelan oil. This is American oil. What if we require that that oil be shipped on American ships and suddenly, over the next decade or two, our shipyards were to build 180 supertankers or, if they are Panamax-size ships, 384 Panamax-size ships?

Think of the employment that would take place in the American shipyards and then through the entire supply train, all of the engines, all of the communications, all of the electronics, all of the pumps, all of the valves. We could see a resurgence in American manufacturing.

Who benefits from this? Americans benefit. Americans benefit in the shipyards and in the manufacturing facilities all across this Nation.

But, no, we are not going to do that here on the House floor. We are going to simply take a bill that opens the spigot and that gives the benefits to the oil patch, to the petroleum industry.

And I am not saying that is not good for them. There will certainly be jobs. There will be some construction jobs, and there will be oil rigs that will have to be built. That is good.

But think what we could do if we had a law that said: Okay. We are going to ship, but we are going to protect the domestic price of refined products, we are going to protect the American refineries, we are going to build American ships, and we are going to put American mariners on those ships.

We are talking about tens of thousands, if not a hundred thousand, new jobs in the United States. That is a good thing for the middle class. That is a good thing for America.

We can do it by simply amending the oil export bill. But it is not going to happen. The majority here isn't going to allow that. They are simply going to pass a bill that opens the spigot.

It is a shame. Shame on all of us if we would allow that to happen. Shame on us if we do not protect the American consumer. Shame on us if we do not protect the American maritime industry, the shipyards of America, the American middle class.

Watch closely. It is going to happen. It is going to happen here on the House floor this week while all of the attention of America is looking at this Speakership thing.

Okay. That is where we are on one critical issue. I want to take up one more and then I will call it a night.

That is a new Amtrak locomotive for the Eastern Corridor, and it is 100 percent American-made. Why is it 100 percent American-made for the first time in decades—well, at least a decade and a half—and that the United States is once again producing locomotives?

By the way, that is made near my district, in Sacramento. It is about 4 or 5 miles from the edge of my district. Several hundred men and women are employed doing this.

Why did this happen? Because the Congress wrote policy that said your taxpayer dollars are going to be used not to buy a locomotive made in China or Japan or Europe, but to buy a locomotive made in America, made in America. Your tax dollars are being used to build locomotives in America.

It is part of a transportation policy, which is where I want to go now. Before I do, I guess I forgot this.

This is a liquefied natural gas tanker. I was just talking about crude oil and what could be done. This is another one. If we are going to export our natural gas—that strategic asset—it ought to be exported on American-made liquefied natural tankers.

A new facility is opening down in Texas to export liquefied natural gas. That facility will take 100 tankers for that one facility. Not to worry. Those tankers are going to be made in China, Japan, Korea. They are not going to be made in America.

But under 16 lines of law—all we need to do is write 16 lines of law—we would be manufacturing these tankers in the United States.

It is the same argument that I made about the crude oil tankers. I won't go into it in any more detail. This is one of the great could-do's, should-do's, ought-to-do's for America.

So the export of these strategic national assets—natural gas, petroleum—why don't we build them in America? Why don't we make it in America?

I started to talk about the locomotives. October 29 is just about 23 days from today. The highway trust fund is out of money. Once again, we are on one of those cliffs—this time, a transportation cliff—and we have got to do something.

And so what are we going to do? The President proposed the GROW America Act. It provides money for our crumbling transportation system, the infrastructure structure.

There is a rail portion of it, locomotives, improving the rail system. There are buses, ports, bridges, and highways. It is a very, very good piece of legislation. It is \$476 billion over the next 6 years. It is a big deal.

□ 2000

It helps America come from number, I think, 18 in the infrastructure capability compared to other nations of the world.

China has, I don't know, 5,000, 3,000 miles of high-speed rail. The United States has zero. Chinese airports, Japanese airports. I think even Cuba is now in the process of building a new deep-water port to take the Panamax ships.

And what are we doing? Not much. The Grow America Act is totally stalled. It is not going anywhere right now.

But we have got 23 days. So what are we proposing? Are we proposing something that will increase the rail capacity in the United States, that will combine rail, ports, and highways into a system to provide for goods movement, freight movement, integrated? No, we are not going to do such a thing. Other countries do it. Hey, but this is America. We just like to fall behind.

So where are we with the Grow America Act? Well, some of us have introduced it. Some of us think we ought to do something like this, that we really ought to pay for our infrastructure.

Oh, by the way, this doesn't raise gas taxes. It doesn't raise diesel taxes, but it does require that those American corporations that have skipped out on their obligation to their home country to bring their profits back to the United States and be taxed.

So we maintain the existing excise tax on gasoline and fuel, and we pay for the rest of this by having American corporations pay their just due to this Nation by repatriating their foreign earnings hidden off somewhere in Ireland or some other tax havens, not taxed, even though they are American corporations.

Oh, and some of this stuff is just too good.

Apple, an American company, all of their manufacturing is overseas, and most of their profits are overseas also because, even though it is invented here, even though the software, even though the new equipment is invented in California, it is licensed in Ireland, and the profits stay in Ireland and are taxed there at a very low percentage—not fair to America.

So those profits would come home from other companies as well, and it would fill this \$476 billion over 6 years.

I want to just go through some of this, and then we will wrap this up.

The Grow America Act would provide \$52 billion a year for highways. We are presently spending \$41 billion a year for highways, so we are looking at something \$11 billion more for highways. Maybe there won't be so many potholes. Maybe one out of four bridges in the United States will get repaired. Right now, they are deficient. They could fall down. They are insufficient in capacity. Maybe we could do that.

Now, the Senate has done a little better. The Senate has passed a highway bill that is \$46 billion a year, which is \$5 billion more than we are currently

spending, and that is good. It is a 5-year program that is only paid for in 3 years.

Huh? How does that work? It doesn't, but it is a good start. But the Grow America Act, \$52 billion a year.

Anybody take buses in the United States? Anybody take BART in California, or the Metro system in Los Angeles, or here in Washington, the Metro, or the subways in Chicago, New York, Atlanta and so forth? That is called transit. We are presently spending about \$10 billion, \$10.6 billion a year on transit, supporting these transportation systems. The Senate bill adds about \$2 billion, so they go to \$12.5 billion.

The Grow America Act, let's get on with it. Let's build those systems. \$19 billion, without raising your fuel taxes.

But if you happen to be those American companies that have skipped out on their obligation to this Nation, they are going to wind up paying their fair share.

So we go from 10.6 for transit, \$10.6 billion annually for transit, to \$19 billion in the Grow America Act.

Remember, I put some of these trains up here? We presently spend \$1.4 billion on our rail system—not the transit. This is the heavy rail system. The Senate would go to \$2.2 billion, and the Grow America Act would go to \$4.7 billion.

Are we going to do this? Not likely. Not likely.

We have perfected a childhood game here in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In fact, your American Government has perfected this game. Something, when you didn't have a ball to kick around, you would kick a can around. It is called kick the can down the road. We have perfected that. I think we have done it more than 30 times to transportation over the last decade and a half.

We are highly likely to do it again, as the attention of America and the attention here amongst all of us is focused on the Speakership fights, which will culminate at the end of October when the Speaker retires and we will have a new vote. But in the intervening 23 days, are we going to focus on a transportation program for America or are we going to focus on the internal politics of the House of Representatives?

I will tell you where I would put my money. I would put my money on the House of Representatives worrying about the internal politics of who is going to be the next leader and not paying attention to what America wants us to do.

America wants us to pay attention to their needs, not to the internal politics of this place, but to the needs of America, American jobs for American workers.

Can we build ships? Oh, yeah, we can build ships.

Can we build liquefied natural gas tankers? You bet we can. We are already building ships that are fueled by

liquefied natural gas. We are doing it in San Diego. We know how to do this. We would have to ramp up. We are not going to build 180 ships in 1 year, but we sure could over the next two decades.

But maybe we care more about the petroleum industry than we do about the American worker and the American sailor and the shipyards of America. I am afraid that is the way it is likely to be here.

I notice that I am joined here by an extraordinary woman from what used to be the manufacturing center of the United States, the Midwest, Ohio, to be quite clear.

MARCY KAPTUR, I have been going on for more than I probably should have in time but, boy, these are important issues. These are really important issues. Please join us.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from California for being an extraordinary leader on Make It In America and restoring prosperity to all corners of this country. The citizens of California really have sent an amazing Congressman to speak on behalf of the Nation and the importance of making items in America.

It is probably a tragedy, over the last three decades, that we have accumulated over \$9 trillion in trade deficit, which translates into lost wealth, lost income for America's families, and, ultimately, a budget deficit that we just can't get under control because people aren't earning enough. So much economic activity has been outsourced that there are many who have forgotten how much manufacturing actually matters.

So I agree with the gentleman. Make it in America, grow it in America, use the technology of America to transform farm field products into ethanol and biodiesel.

Let us use the sun. Let us invent our way forward to become energy independent because, at some point, not in our lifetime, but at some point over the next 100 years, the oil wells will run dry, and even the natural gas fields currently being discovered in Ohio and Pennsylvania, which are mother lode supplies with horizontal drilling, those are finite and they will be gone. So the world with many more people is going to have to figure out how to sustain life.

The gentleman has addressed many of these issues in terms of energy production, America's need to become energy secure, which would create prosperity here at home, and also all the investments of hard infrastructure on rail, on over-the-road, air transportation.

I have to add, obviously, our ports and, in my part of the country, the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway so in need of infrastructure improvement, several billion dollars actually.

We are having a Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway meeting tomorrow

morning, inviting in many of the business interests along the seaway and looking for ways in our transportation bill where we can make more investment in that region so it can sing fully economically again.

So I thank the gentleman for a moment here. And believe me, I unite with you in your efforts to make America fully strong again, and Make It In America can lead us down that path.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You have been a leader on these issues for many, many years and certainly in your territory of Ohio. You saw what happened when the manufacturing plants left; but they are coming back, and we can make policy to do that.

I think you may have other things that you would like to bring to our attention. You are certainly welcome to do so.

I think with that, it is time for me to say "enough," or maybe I have said too much already.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this evening, just before votes, I went outside on the balcony here of this Capitol to watch the sun set. It was one of those beautiful evenings of crimson and gold and gray clouds silhouetted against the twilight glow of the evening. And then I glanced over to the buildings here at the Capitol and was suddenly brought back to reality when I saw so many flags on our buildings flying at half mast, flying at half mast because, once again, we are remembering the tragedies that have shaken our Nation time and time again.

This has been a bloody summer, a bloody summer of many attacks that have been associated with folks with mental illness.

I know most people with mental illness are not violent, and I know that there are many other tragedies that occur; but tonight, during this week, which is Mental Health Week in America, I want to highlight, Madam Speaker, what we must do as a nation, what we cannot continue to push aside.

Just think of what happened this summer, just a few examples:

June 13, attack on the Dallas Police headquarters by a man who had a history of family violence and mental instability;

July 23, Lafayette, Louisiana, a shooting in a movie theater by a man who had had a judge's orders to send him to a mental hospital in the past;

August 16, Antioch, Tennessee, a movie theater attack;

August 26, Roanoke, Virginia, a live, on-air shooting, a tragic scene of a reporter being killed, and a cameraman;

August 28, 2015, Houston, Texas, while a deputy police officer was at a gas station, riddled with bullets by a man who had a history of mental illness;

September 22, the son of a State senator, former State senator of Virginia, killed a man, and also killed himself in Bowling Green;

And this last week, October 1, in Roseburg, Oregon, nine people were killed, and the gunman killed himself in another tragic scene.

There is more to it than this, of course. In this country last year, 125 people with mental illness were killed in some sort of a police shooting where the police oftentimes did not even know, but the confrontation grew and ended in a death.

It is estimated there were somewhere between 1,200 and 1,500 murders in this country this last year by people with mental illness. But more than that, there are 10,000 or more, maybe 20,000, maybe 100,000 people with mental illness who are the victims of crime. Some are killed.

There are thousands and thousands of people who are homeless, who die that slow-motion death of homelessness, of their physical ailments and their illnesses.

There were 41,000 suicide deaths, 1.2 million suicide attempts that required some medical care, 43,000 substance abuse overdose deaths. This list goes on and on and on.

And what happens is, when we treat people with mental illness early in their life, their prognosis is improved. In many cases, they can go on to have fruitful lives. But when it is untreated, they likely develop other problems, not just with mental illness, but social, job, and physical health.

Persons with serious mental illness, in treatment, are 15 times less likely to engage in an act of violence than those who are not in treatment.

□ 2015

In America, some 60 million people in any given year will have some diagnosable mental illness, from the very mild and transient ones, which we all experience, to severe mental illness, such as schizophrenia or bipolar or extreme depression. But of those with serious mental illness, about 4 million of those 11 million will not have any treatment for a variety of reasons: treatment may not be available; they may refuse treatment; or what happens so often with those with serious mental illness, they are characteristically unaware that they have an illness—it is a brain illness, a serious mental illness—like a person with Alzheimer's or stroke or traumatic brain injury, a person who may not even know that they have a problem.

What do we do about this as a nation? Mostly we just talk. Sadly and tragically, what we do here in the House of Representatives, we will have a moment of silence, but it is not followed by action. What we need is not more silence. We need action.

Madam Speaker, we need people in this country to rise up and say: This is the time. This is the day. This is the issue where we are, once and for all, going to do comprehensive reform of our mental health system in America.

Our mental health system in America is fragmented at best, a system with regulations that are abusive and neglectful towards those with serious mental illness. And more so, it is worse if you are a minority or low-income.

This is odd because in a field that is filled with some of the most compassionate and caring people I know, people I have had the pleasure to work side by side with in my role as a psychologist, we have Federal policies and State policies that leave their hands tied, their eyes blinded, and their mouths gagged to prevent treatment from occurring. Ultimately, the individuals suffer and their families suffer. Tonight we will review what the problem is and what can be done systematically, thoroughly, and definitively, what this country must do if we are serious about treating mental illness.

One of my colleagues from the Toledo area, who represents northern Ohio, is with us now. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you, Congressman MURPHY, for yielding to me. I want to say how fortunate the country is that the people of Pennsylvania have elected you here to serve the people of our Nation with the strong background that you have and with the obvious depths of knowledge that you have about those who are mentally ill and the compassion you have in a field that is very difficult, where the answers still remain incomplete.

I want to be on the floor this evening to say to those who are listening in the Chamber, to those who may be listening outside, your efforts to draft the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, is a watershed moment in this Congress.

I have served in this Congress a lot longer than the others on the floor this evening. I was here in 1998 when, sadly, we lost two of our Capitol Police officers, Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson. A diagnosed schizophrenic receiving Federal SSI benefits but off his medicines and estranged from his family headed on a rampage all across the country, all the way from the West to here, and delusionally, he set out to quash, I guess, a purple force he had tracked here to the Capitol.

He broke into the majority leader's office. All the staff went under the desks. I thought, well, maybe this is the moment that Congress will finally face up to the violent impulses that have fallen right at our knees. I said, but I would wager one of two things will happen: either we will finally cut the mustard and do what is right, or we will have more barricades and armed officers. Well, it was the latter option that actually happened.

As we mourn the deaths of nine innocent victims at Umpqua Community